UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,089	08/06/2001	Harold V. Putman	D-1144	9431

28995 7590 02/10/2005

RALPH E. JOCKE
walker & jocke LPA
231 SOUTH BROADWAY
MEDINA, OH 44256

EXAMINER	
LEE, SEUNG H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2876	

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/923,089
Filing Date: August 06, 2001
Appellant(s): PUTMAN ET AL.

Ralph E. Jocke
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed April 14, 2004.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after the second Office Action mailed November 19, 2003 contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Issues

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) Grouping of Claims

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1-40 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

The following is a listing of the prior art of record relied upon in the rejection of claims under appeal.

6,378,770	Clark et al.	7-2002
6,311,165	Coutts et al.	10-2001

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1, 8, 9, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Clark et al. (US 6,378,770)(hereinafter referred to as 'Clark').

Clark teaches a automated teller machine (ATM)(10) comprising controller unit (30) serving as a computer, a cash dispenser (18) serving as a transaction function device wherein the cash dispenser is operative connection with the controller unit, a second display device (20) and a first display device (28) in operative connection with controller unit, a first type input device or keypad (27) associated with the first display (28) and a second input device or a card reader (14) associated with the second display (28) wherein the first and the second input devices are different type and are in operative connection with the controller unit, the control unit having a processing unit (32) and memory unit (34) for executing banking procedure or software to displaying the instruction of requesting user to input the personal identification number (PIN) using keypad (27) on the first display (28) and reading input data from the card reader (14) and displaying the information on the second display (20) thereon, and executing of

banking procedure of the control unit producing two output layer according to the user panel, that is, the control unit is generating screen information including a card reader (14) information on the user side panel (12) and the controller unit is generating the screen information without the card reader information on the operator side panel (26) in which the display screen is menu driven or command instruction of the banking operation based on users interacting with the ATM, e.g., the display (20) is displaying instruction to user for entering PIN after the controller unit read the data/information stored on the card using the card reader, and the first input device and the first displaying device is accessible by an operator positioned on adjacent to the operator panel (26) whereas the second input device and the second displaying device is accessible by an user positioned on the user panel (12) (14) (see Figs. 1, 2; col. 2, line 53- col. 24).

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark.

The teachings of Clark have been discussed above.

In addition to the teachings of Clark as discussed above, he also teaches that the ATM is not available to customer to use the ATM when the ATM enter a supervisor mode (step 124) for maintenance related function (see Fig. 5; col. 5, lines 47-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Clark in order to provide an user friendly system for displaying a plurality of menu for supervisor mode related functions (e.g.,

status report, replenishing cash, etc.) on the first monitor along displaying message on the second displaying device, such as "temporarily out of order", etc. in which serves as a spanning of displaying devices.

Claims 4-7, 10-28, and 31-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark in view of Coutts et al. (US 6,311,165)(hereinafter referred to as 'Coutts').

The teachings of Clark have been discussed above.

Although, Clark teaches the ATM storing the software/program to execute various commands for operating the ATM, he fail to particularly teach or fairly suggest that the document including commands is hardware independent.

However, Coutts teaches the ATM wherein the ATM is operated using a software/program serving as an electronic document in which the software/program is created with the JAVA program language wherein the JAVA program language is hardware independent type program language, and the software/program including the event processors such as ATMInterface, CardReader, CashDispenser serving as a maintenance function, etc. wherein the event processors can be invoked by inserting card into card reader and/or entering the data using keyboard, the ATM terminal also including touch screen for emulating mouse device in which is serving as a pointing device and/or a function key, and the JAVA program is compiled with the main application including commands for importing the JAVA class files such as Account, CardReader, etc. and/or creating the objects or constructors wherein the imported JAVA

class files, created objects, and constructors are including human readable language and command to generate the graphical user interface (GUI) on the display of the ATM (see Figs. 1, 4-5, 11, 10, 18, 22-29, 33, 42-58; col. 1, lines 19-65; col. 24, line 46- col. 56, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the well-known JAVA language as taught by Coutts to the teachings of Clark in order to provide an hardware independent program due to the fact that the JAVA program is known in the art to for the hardware independence programming language, that is, running every hardware after compiling source code once. Moreover, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that the JAVA programming language is importing the class files into the main application source file or applets in order to provide an object oriented programming capability wherein the class files and objects can have the event processor to invoke the GUI to interact with various peripherals such as a card reader, keypad, a display, etc. Furthermore, Clark as modified by Coutts fail to particularly mention the fist document, a second document, a first command, a second command, a third command, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realize that the first document, the second document, the first command, the second command, the third command are used to generate the GUI system programmed with JAVA programming language, that is, a source file is needed to generate the executable file by compiling the source file and the commands are needed to generate the GUI

interface that displays buttons, text fields, etc. to receiving input from the user(s) and executing proper functions with user input, and therefore an obvious expedient.

(11) Response to Argument

The examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant's comments and arguments as stated in the "argument" section of the Appeal Brief, for following reasons:

Re Claim 1:

Appellant contents that "Clark does not disclose or suggest software or any other element of an ATM which determines the types of different input devices in the ATM" (see page 8, 4th paragraph). Further, Appellant contents that "Clam 1 further recites that the at least one software application is operative to cause a first user interface to be output through the first display device responsive to the determined first type of the first input device. Clam 1 also recites that the at least one software application is operative to cause a second user interface to be output through the second display device responsive to the determined second type of the second input device" (see page 9, 1st paragraph) and that "Clark does not disclose or suggest generating first and second user interface through first and second displays of an automated banking machine responsive to the particular type of the input device determined to be associated with each display." (see page 9, 3rd paragraph).

The examiner respectfully disagrees with Appellant wherein Clark et al. discloses a processor unit (32) for executing banking procedure such as controlling components

connected to the processor unit, displaying information on the display devices (20 and 28), and printing information using printers (22 and 29) wherein such operation (e.g., banking procedure) of a controller unit (30) having the processor unit is well known in the art and serves as a software. Furthermore, Clark et a. discloses a user panel (12) associated with a card reader (14), a key pad (16), a display (20), and a receipt printer (22), and an operator panel (26) associated a keypad (27), a display (28), and a printer (29) as shown in figure 2 of drawing, wherein the user panel and the operator panel are connected with a controller unit (30) in which the controller unit includes aforementioned processor unit for controlling each panel accordingly using the stored banking procedure or software, that is, the control unit will display proper information on the display device after determining source of the input devices that is used by user or operator.

Re Claims 8 and 9:

Appellant contents that "Clark does not disclose or suggest software or any other elements of its AMT which is operative to determine a capability of the input devices included in at least two user stations." (see page 10, 2nd paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Appellant wherein Clark shows that the CPU is receiving input data/information from devices such as a card reader (14) and a keypad (16) and sending output data/information to a display (20) and a receipt printer (22) or receiving input data/information from a keypad (27) and sending an output data/information to a display (28) and a printer (29) wherein such data/information

transmitting (e.g., receiving and/or sending data information) means are shown by using arrows as shown in figure 2 of Clark, therefore, the ATM of Clark comprises a capability of determining input sources of the user station.

Re Claim 29:

Appellant contents that "Clark does not disclose or suggest a banking machine in which an authorized user is capable of performing servicing operation with the machine while positioned adjacent either the first user station or the second user station of the machine." (see page 12, 1st paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Appellant wherein an authorized user (e.g. a customer) positioned adjacent to the panels can perform banking services such as depositing and/or withdrawing money to/from the ATM as shown in figure 1 while an authorized user (e.g., an operator) positioned adjacent to the operator panel can perform services such as periodic scheduled maintenance service, etc.

Re Claim 30:

Appellant contents that "Clark does not disclose or suggest that the at least one software application is operative to the determined first type to include at least one first user interface element in a first user interface which is adapted for selecting using the first input device.....the at least one software application is operative responsive to the determined second type to include at least one second user interface element in a second user interface which is adapted for selection using the second input device...a

computer of an automated banking machine which is operative to perform a common servicing operation, responsive to selection of either the at least one first or the at least one second user interface elements" (see page 12, 2nd paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Appellant wherein Clark teaches a keypad (27) serving as a first type input device whereas a card reader (14) serving as a second input device in which the first and second input devices are connected to the display devices respectively positioned in the user panel or the operator panel for providing banking related services using the controller unit (32) operated by stored banking procedures or software, the controller unit also transmitting data/information to respective display devices, that is, data/information related with the input device (e.g., the card reader located in the user panel) will be displayed on the display device (20) located in the user panel where as data/information related with the input device (e.g., the keypad located in the operator panel) will be displayed on the display device (28) located on the operator panel.

Re Claim 2:

Appellant contents that "Clark does not disclose or suggest a desktop which spans the first and second display devices.....Nowhere in Clark is there a teaching, suggestion, or motivation to create a single desktop environment in an automated banking machine which single desktop environment spans two displays of an automated banking machine." (see page 14, 4th paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant wherein Clark et al. teaches that the ATM can be entered the supervisor mode for maintenance related functions such as replenishing cash in which the customers are not allowed to use the ATM for withdrawing/depositing money during the ATM in the supervisor mode. In fact, during operator conduct the maintenance operation, the operator can be operate the ATM using the input device located in the operator panel whereas the display device located in the user panel is displaying indicative information to the customers such as "temporally out of order", etc. wherein such displaying information in the user panel due to the operation occurred in the operation panel serves as a spanning of the display devices.

Re Claim 3:

Appellant contents that "Clark does not disclose or suggest an automated banking machine that includes a software application that is operative to cause first user interface to be produced in a first portion of a desktop environment that is being output through a first display device of machine, and to cause second user interface to be produced in a second portion of the desktop environment that is being output through the second display device of the machine" (see page 15, 2nd paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the appellant wherein Clark teaches the banking procedure or software store in the memory device in the controller unit to produce information to be displayed on the first or second display device according to the input devices associated therewith.

Re Claim 4:

Appellant contents that "Clark does not disclose or suggest an automated banking machine that is operative to cause output of user interface responsive to both a document and determined types of input devices." (see page 16, 2nd paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant wherein display devices in the ATM of Clark can display information responsive to a document or banking procedure and according to the input devices, for example, the ATM can display an phrase such as a "Please insert a banking card" in which such phrase is produced by the banking procedure then after reading information stored in the banking card using the card reader, the display device can display a phrase such as "Please enter a PIN using a keypad" in which such phrase is produced according to the determined input devices, in this case, the card reader.

Re Claim 5:

Appellant contents that "nowhere does the Action indicate where Clark or Coutts teaches an automated banking machine with both a software application and a document" (page 17, 2nd paragraph) and "...the Action does not indicate where Clark or Coutts disclose or suggest a document with command instructions that correspond to hardware independent user interface elements." (see page 17, 3rd paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant wherein the ATM machine of Coutts is operated by using a software or program in which such program serves as an

electronic document. Aforementioned software is written in JAVA programming language, a type of well known in the art for the hardware independent programming language for operating various electronic devices including a plurality of functional devices (e.g., a card reader, a keypad, etc.) of ATM machine wherein such program written in JAVA language contains a command to control electronic devices of the ATM machines.

Re Claims 6 and 7:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests a document with command instructions, which instructions are operative to specify an event processor included in a software application. In addition, neither reference disclose or suggest a computer in the machine which invokes the event processor responsive to both the command instructions in the document and an input from either a first device associated with a first display or a second input device associated with a second display" (see page 18, 1st paragraph) and "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests a computer which is responsive to an input from either a first input device associated with a first display or a second input device associated with a second display, to invoke an event processor which causes an automated banking machine to perform a maintenance related function (see page 18, 2nd paragraph)

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant wherein the JAVA program of Coutts comprises a plurality of event processors such as ATMInterface, CardReader, CashDispenser invokable by the stored program of computer of the ATM machine or

input devices connected to the computer of ATM machine such as a card reader or a keypad wherein the status of the such event is displayed on the display devices for notifying the processing status accordingly to users (e.g., customers or operators) wherein aforementioned processors also serves as a maintenance related functions.

Re claim 10:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests a software application that is operative to output a user interface for each user station, responsive to command instructions in a document." (see page 18, 3rd paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant wherein Clark teaches the banking procedure or software stored in the controller unit of the ATM machine comprises dual interfaces for providing outputs to the each interface according to the input associated with responsive input devices whereas Coutts teaches the computer of the ATM machine is operated using a JAVA program having command instructions.

Re Claim 11:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests a software application in an automated banking machine that is responsive to a first command instruction in a document and a determined capability of pointing device, to generate a user interface element that is adapted for selection using the pointing deice." (see page 19, 1st paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the appellant wherein the ATM machine of Coutts also comprises a touch screen for emulating pointing device such as mouse device for selecting of menu provided on the display device wherein the computer of ATM is operated using the JAVA program having commands instruction.

Re Claims 12 and 13:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests a software application in an automated banking machine that invokes a common function of an event processor responsive to a first command instruction in a document, and either a selection of a first user interface element with an input from a pointing device of a first user station, or selection of a second user interface element with an input from a key of a second user station." (see page 19, 2nd paragraph) and "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests an event processor that causes a transaction function device of an automated banking machine to perform an operation responsive to either a first input from a pointer device at a first user station or a second input from a key at a second user station" (see page 19. 3rd paragraph)

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant wherein Clark teaches the banking procedure or software stored in the controller unit of the ATM machine comprises dual interfaces for providing outputs to the each interface to the each interface according to the input associated with user interfaces or either the user panel or the operator panel in which Coutts also comprises a touch screen for emulating pointing device such as mouse device for selecting of menu provide on the display

devices of wherein the computer of ATM is operated using the JAVA program having commands instruction. Also, the JAVA program of Coutts comprises a plurality of event processors such as ATMInterface, CardReader, CashDispenser invokable by the stored program of computer of the ATM machine for performing banking transaction using function devices such as card reader, etc.

Re claim 14:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests a computer that causes an automated banking machine to perform a common maintenance operation..." (see page 20, 2nd paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant wherein the JAVA program of Coutts comprises a plurality of event processors such as ATMInterface, CardReader, CashDispenser invokable by the stored program of computer of the ATM machine or input devices connected with the computer of ATM machine such as a card reader or a keypad wherein the status of the such event is displayed on the display devices for notifying the processing status accordingly to users (e.g., customers or operators) wherein aforementioned processors also serves as a maintenance related functions.

Re claims 15-17:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests a computer that causes an automated banking machine that includes a first command instruction in a first document with a first label in a first human language, and a third

command instruction in a second document with a second label in a second human language, that has a meaning corresponding to the first label. Further, neither reference discloses or suggests that the third command instruction in the second document corresponding to the first command instruction in the first document. In addition, neither reference discloses or suggests a software in an automated banking machine that is operative to output user interface at a first and a second user station, with indicia in the second human language responsive to both the first and second document." (see page 20, 3rd paragraph),

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant wherein the JAVA program is compiled with the main application including commands for importing the JAVA class files such as Account, CardReader, etc. and/or creating the objects or constructors wherein the imported JAVA class files, created objects, and constructors are including human readable language such as instructions and descriptions of each files and command to generate the graphical user interface (GUI) on the display of the ATM having a human readable language, for example, the display may display a message "Insert card", "Enter PIN", etc. wherein such displayed message is generated by the JAVA program stored in the automated banking machine and according to inputs of user lactated at the user panel and/or the operator panel. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realize that the first document, the second document, the first command, the second command, the third command are used to generate the GUI system programmed with JAVA programming language, that is, a source file is needed to generate the executable file

by compiling the source file and the commands are needed to generate the GUI interface that displays buttons, text fields, messages, etc. to receiving input from the user(s) and executing proper functions with user input.

Re claim 18:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests a computer that causes an automated banking machine that determines a first type associated with a first input device of the machine.....presenting a first user interface through a first display that is associated with the first input device, responsive to the determined type of the first input device....presenting a first user interface through a first display device responsive to both a determined first type of a first input device and at least one first document provided to the machine." (see page 22, 1st paragraph).

The examiner respectfully disagrees with Appellant wherein Clark et al. discloses a processor unit (32) for executing banking procedure such as controlling components connected to the processor unit, displaying information on the display devices (20 and 28), and printing information using printers (22 and 29) wherein such operation (e.g., banking procedure) of a controller unit (30) having the processor unit is well known in the art and serves as a software. Furthermore, Clark et a. discloses a user panel (12) associated with a card reader (14), a key pad (16), a display (20), and a receipt printer (22), and an operator panel (26) associated a keypad (27), a display (28), and a printer (29) as shown in figure 2 of drawing, wherein the user panel and the operator panel are connected with a controller unit (30) in which the controller unit includes aforementioned

processor unit for controlling each panel accordingly using the stored banking procedure or software, that is, the control unit will display proper information on the display device after determining source of the input devices that is used by user or operator.

Re claims 19 and 20:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests a determining both a first type and a second type associated with first and second input devices respectively.... presenting first and second user interfaces through first and second display devices respectively, responsive to the determined first types of input devices and at least one first document." (see page 22, 3rd paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Appellant wherein Clark teaches a keypad (27) serving as a first type input device whereas a card reader (14) serving as a second input device in which the first and second input devices are connected to the display devices respectively positioned in the user panel or the operator panel for providing banking related services using the controller unit (32) operated by stored banking procedures or software, the controller unit also transmitting data/information to respective display devices, that is, data/information related with the input device (e.g., the card reader located in the user panel) will be displayed on the display device (20) located in the user panel where as data/information related with the input device (e.g., the keypad located in the operator panel) will be displayed on the display device (28) located on the operator panel. And Coutts teaches that the ATM is operated using a

software/program serving as an electronic document. Therefore, given its broadest reasonable interpretation of this instant claimed invention, the combination of Clark (as described above) and Coutts meets the claimed limitation.

Re claims 21 and 22:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests dispensing a cash responsive to a document and a first input through a first input device associated with a first display device of the machine, and dispensing cash responsive to the documents and a second input through a second input device associated with a second display device of the machine." (see page 23, 2nd paragraph) and "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests performing a maintenance related operation with the automated banking machine responsive to a document and a first input through a first input device associated with a first display device of the machine, and performing the maintenance related operation with machine responsive to the document and second input through a second input device associated with a second display device of the machine." (see page 23, 3rd paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant wherein the user panel and the operator panel associated with its own interface device including the display device wherein dispensing cash and/or replenishing cash can be performed using its own interfaces in which such devices/interfaces are operated using program/software stored in the computer or documents stored in the computer in which aforementioned function also serves maintenance related functions.

Re claim 23:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests invoking at least one event processor specified by a first document, responsive to a first input through a first input device associated with a first display device of the machine, and invoking the at least one event processor specified by the first document responsive to a second input through a second input device associated with a second display device of the machine." (see page 24, 2nd paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant wherein the JAVA program of Coutts comprises a plurality of event processors such as ATMInterface, CardReader, CashDispenser invokable by the stored program of computer of the ATM machine or input devices connected with the computer of ATM machine such as a card reader or a keypad wherein the status of the such event is displayed on the display devices for notifying the processing status accordingly to users (e.g., customers or operators) wherein aforementioned processors also serves as a maintenance related functions.

Re claims 24-26:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests a computer that causes an automated banking machine that determines a first type associated with a first input device of the machine.....presenting a first user interface through a first display responsive to a determined at least one first type of an input device and the at least one second document....at least one second document that

includes at least one language translation of indicia included in the first document." (see page 24, 3rd paragraph), "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests substituting for a first command instruction in the at least one first document, a second corresponding command instruction in the at least one second document...a first command instruction includes a first label in a first human language, and a second command instruction includes a second label in a dialect of the first human language." (see page 25, 3rd paragraph), and "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests an automated banking machine that determines a first type associated with a first input device of the machine. (see page 26, 2nd paragraph).

The examiner respectfully disagrees with Appellant wherein Clark et al. discloses a processor unit (32) for executing banking procedure such as controlling components connected to the processor unit, displaying information on the display devices (20 and 28), and printing information using printers (22 and 29) wherein such operation (e.g., banking procedure) of a controller unit (30) having the processor unit is well known in the art and serves as a software. Furthermore, Clark et a. discloses a user panel (12) associated with a card reader (14), a key pad (16), a display (20), and a receipt printer (22), and an operator panel (26) associated a keypad (27), a display (28), and a printer (29) as shown in figure 2 of drawing, wherein the user panel and the operator panel are connected with a controller unit (30) in which the controller unit includes aforementioned processor unit for controlling each panel accordingly using the stored banking procedure or software, that is, the control unit will display proper information on the display device after determining source of the input devices that is used by user or

operator. Moreover, the JAVA program of Coutts is compiled with the main application including commands for importing the JAVA class files such as Account, CardReader, etc. and/or creating the objects or constructors wherein the imported JAVA class files, created objects, and constructors are including human readable language such as instructions and descriptions of each files and command to generate the graphical user interface (GUI) on the display of the ATM having a human readable language, for example, the display may display a message "Insert card", "Enter PIN", etc. wherein such displayed message is generated by the JAVA program stored in the automated banking machine and according to inputs of user lactated at the user panel and/or the operator panel. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realize that the first document, the second document, the first command, the second command, the third command are used to generate the GUI system programmed with JAVA programming language, that is, a source file is needed to generate the executable file by compiling the source file and the commands are needed to generate the GUI interface that displays buttons, text fields, etc. to receiving input from the user(s) and executing proper functions with user input.

Re claim 27:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses including in the first user interface at least one first user interface element that is adapted for selection by a first input device responsive to determining at least one first type associated with the first input device....including in the second user interface at least one second user

interface element that is adapted for selection by a second input device responsive to determining at least performing these steps wherein the first input devoice and the second input device corresponding to different types of input devices." (see page 27, 2nd paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Appellant wherein Clark teaches a keypad (27) serving as a first type input device whereas a card reader (14) serving as a second input device in which the first and second input devices are connected to the display devices respectively positioned in the user panel or the operator panel for providing banking related services using the controller unit (32) operated by stored banking procedures or software, the controller unit also transmitting data/information to respective display devices, that is, data/information related with the first input device (e.g., the card reader located in the user panel) will be displayed on the first display device (20) located in the user panel where as data/information related with the second input device (e.g., the keypad located in the operator panel) will be displayed on the second display device (28) located on the operator panel.

Re claims 28 and 32:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests that steps (f) and (g) recited in claim 27 are carried out responsive to at least one instruction in a markup language which specifies the inclusion of a user interface element in a user interface generated responsive to the markup language document." (see page 27, 3rd paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Appellant wherein Coutts teaches the ATM machine is operated by using JAVA program wherein JAVA program serving as a markup language includes a plurality of events processors for operating each functional devices with displaying message specifying status of the process such as "Insert card", "Enter PIN", etc.

Re Claim 31:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests that a first input device includes a plurality of keys, and at least one software application is operative to the determined first type of the first input device to include at least one first user interface element in a first type of the first user interface which is adapted for selection using the first input device including keys....that the second input device includes a pointer device, and the at least one software application is operative responsive to the determined second type of the second input device to include at least one second user interface element in a second user interface which is adapted for selection suing the second in put device including a pointing device" (see page 28, 1st paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant wherein Clark teaches the banking procedure or software stored in the controller unit of the ATM machine comprises dual interfaces for providing outputs to the each interface to the each interface according to the input associated with user interfaces or either the user panel or the operator panel in which Coutts also comprises a touch screen for emulating

pointing device such as mouse device for selecting of menu provide on the display devices of wherein the computer of ATM is operated sing the JAVA program having commands instruction. Also, the JAVA program of Coutts comprises a plurality of event processors such as ATMInterface, CardReader, CashDispenser invokable by the stored program of computer of the ATM machine for performing banking transaction using function devices such as card reader, etc.

Re claim 33:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests that the at least one software application of the automated banking machine is operative to generate the first and second user interface elements responsive to a command instruction in a markup language document, and that the command instruction specifies a first one of plurality of event processors....at least one software application is operative to invoke the first one of the event processors responsive to the command instruction, and responsive to either the first user interface element being selected with the first input device or the second user interface element being selected with the second input device....the event processor is operative to cause the computer to perform the servicing operation. (see age 28, 3rd paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant wherein Clark teaches the banking procedure or software stored in the controller unit of the ATM machine comprises dual interfaces for providing outputs to the each interface according to the input associated with proper input devices whereas Coutts teaches the computer of the

ATM machine is operated using a JAVA program having command instructions. Therefore, the JAVA program of Coutts invoke a plurality of event processors such as ATMInterface, CardReader, CashDispenser by the stored program of computer of the ATM machine or input devices connected with the computer of ATM machine such as a card reader or a keypad wherein the status of the such event is displayed on the display devices for notifying the processing status accordingly to users (e.g., customers or operators).

Re claim 34:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests that the first user interface element is visually different from the second user interface element." (see page 29, 2nd paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant wherein Clark teaches that the user panel comprises a card reader whereas the operator panel does not comprise a card reader which provides a different visual interfaces.

Re claim 35:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests servicing a cash dispenser responsive to selection of either the at least one first or the at least one second user interface elements..." (see page 30, 1st paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant wherein Clark teaches that the cash dispenser slot (18) for delivering cash to a user.

Re claim 36:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses that the at least one software application is operative to cause the first user interface to be output through the first display device responsive to at least one first input through the first input device, and is operative to the determined first type of the first input device to include in the first user interface at least one first user interface element, which first user interface element is adapted for selection using the first input devices.....the at least one software application is operative to cause the second user interface to be output through the second display device responsive to the at least one second input through the second input device, and is operative responsive to the determined second type of the second input device to include in the second user interface at least one second user interface input device." (see page 30, 2nd paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Appellant wherein Clark teaches a keypad (27) serving as a first type input device whereas a card reader (14) serving as a second input device in which the first and second input devices are connected to the display devices respectively positioned in the user panel or the operator panel for providing banking related services using the controller unit (32) operated by stored banking procedures or software, the controller unit also transmitting data/information to respective display devices, that is, data/information related with the first input device (e.g., the card reader located in the user panel) will be displayed on the first display device (20) located in the user panel where as data/information related with the second

input device (e.g., the keypad located in the operator panel) will be displayed on the second display device (28) located on the operator panel.

Re claim 37:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts alone or in combination discloses or suggests a software application of an automated banking machine which is operative to cause a computer of the machine to determine a first input device type and a second input device type associated respectively, with at least one first input device and at least one second input device of the machine... the software application is also operative to cause a first user interface and a second user interface to be output respectively, through at least one first display and at least one second display of the machine....the software application is operative to include in the first user interface, responsive to at least one command instruction in a document and the first input device type, at least one first user interface element adapted to be selected through the at least one first input device:...the software application include in the second user interface responsive to the at least one command instruction and the second input device type, at least one second user interface element adapted to be selected through the at least one second input device." (see page 31, 1st paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Appellant wherein Clark teaches a keypad (27) serving as a first type input device whereas a card reader (14) serving as a second input device in which the first and second input devices are connected to the display devices respectively positioned in the user panel or the operator panel for

providing banking related services using the controller unit (32) operated by stored banking procedures or software, the controller unit also transmitting data/information to respective display devices, that is, data/information related with the first input device (e.g., the card reader located in the user panel) will be displayed on the first display device (20) located in the user panel where as data/information related with the second input device (e.g., the keypad located in the operator panel) will be displayed on the second display device (28) located on the operator panel. Moreover, Clark teaches the banking procedure or software stored in the controller unit of the ATM machine comprises dual interfaces for providing outputs to the each interface according to the input associated with proper input devices whereas Coutts teaches the computer of the ATM machine is operated using a JAVA program having command instructions. Accordingly, given its broadest reasonable interpretation, the teachings of Clark as modified by Coutts meets the claimed limitations, that is, the dual interface ATM machine of Clark operated using JAVA program as taught by Coutts meets the claimed invention.

Re claim 38:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests an automated banking machine in which the at least one of first input device of a first user station comprises a keypad, and the at least one second input device of the second user station comprises a pointing device." (see page 32, 1st paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the appellant wherein Clark teaches a keypad as an input device and the ATM machine of Coutts also comprises a touch screen for emulating pointing device such as mouse device for selecting of menu provided on the display device.

Re claim 39:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests that the software application is operative to cause the computer, responsive to the selection of either the at least one first user interface element of the first user interface, or the at least one second user interface element of the second user interface, to cause the machine to perform a servicing function." (see page 32, 2nd paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Appellant wherein Clark teaches a keypad (27) serving as a first type input device whereas a card reader (14) serving as a second input device in which the first and second input devices are connected to the display devices respectively positioned in the user panel or the operator panel for providing banking related services using the controller unit (32) operated by stored banking procedures or software, the controller unit also transmitting data/information to respective display devices, that is, data/information related with the input device (e.g., the card reader located in the user panel) will be displayed on the display device (20) located in the user panel where as data/information related with the input device (e.g., the keypad located in the operator panel) will be displayed on the display device (28)

located on the operator panel, wherein aforementioned banking related service serves as a servicing functions.

Re claim 40:

Appellant contents that "Neither Clark nor Coutts discloses or suggests that the software application includes in the first user interface, responsive to at least one command instruction in a markup language document and the first input device type, at least one first user interface element adapted to be selected through the at least one first input device.....the software application includes in the second user interface, responsive to the at least one command instruction in the markup language document and the second input device type, at least one second user interface element adapted to be selected through the at least one second input device." (see page 32, 3rd paragraph).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Appellant wherein Clark teaches a keypad (27) serving as a first type input device whereas a card reader (14) serving as a second input device in which the first and second input devices are connected to the display devices respectively positioned in the user panel or the operator panel for providing banking related services using the controller unit (32) operated by stored banking procedures or software, the controller unit also transmitting data/information to respective display devices, that is, data/information related with the first input device (e.g., the card reader located in the user panel) will be displayed on the first display device (20) located in the user panel where as data/information related with the second

input device (e.g., the keypad located in the operator panel) will be displayed on the second display device (28) located on the operator panel. Moreover, Clark teaches the banking procedure or software stored in the controller unit of the ATM machine comprises dual interfaces for providing outputs to the each interface according to the input associated with proper input devices whereas Coutts teaches the computer of the ATM machine is operated using a JAVA program having command instructions. Accordingly, given its broadest reasonable interpretation, the teachings of Clark as modified by Coutts meets the claimed limitations, that is, the dual interface ATM machine of Clark operated using JAVA program as taught by Coutts meets the claimed invention.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Seung H. Lee Examiner Art Unit 2876

SHL
January 9, 2005

Appeal Conference: December 6, 2004

Michael G. Lee
Conferee, SPE 2876,

MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Georgia Epps
Conferee, SPE 2873

Ralph E. Jocke
231 South Broadway
Medina, Ohio 44256

Seung H. Lee
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Patent Examiner
571-272-2401